

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
for the**FILED**

JUN 28 2021

Mr. Maurice Miles, Sr.
Petitioner

v. "THE BIG BOND \$1M,"
and People of the State of
California, and Sheriff
SCOTT JONES = (SACRA)
Respondent

(name of warden or authorized person having custody of petitioner)

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY _____
DEPUTY CLERK

2:21-CV-1143 GGH HC

Case No.

(Supplied by Clerk of Court)

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 2241**Personal Information**

1. (a) Your full name: MR MAURICE D. MILES, SR.
 (b) Other names you have used: THE POET DEON
2. Place of confinement:
 (a) Name of institution: SACRAMENTO SHERIFF COUNTY JAIL
 (b) Address: 651 I STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
3. (c) Your identification number: (560593714 / CVSP# AVOTRIS) RULE 8 FRCP...
 Are you currently being held on orders by:
 Federal authorities State authorities Other - explain: FRAUD AUTHORITIES
4. Are you currently:
 A pretrial detainee (waiting for trial on criminal charges)
 Serving a sentence (incarceration, parole, probation, etc.) after having been convicted of a crime

If you are currently serving a sentence, provide:

- (a) Name and location of court that sentenced you: Los Angeles Superior Court
Department 101... Ronald S. Coen, Judge
 (b) Docket number of criminal case: BA385119-01/(CV13-3425)(CV-14-1063)(DDPLIS)
 (c) Date of sentencing: 6-27-2012

- Being held on an immigration charge
 Other (explain): I was illegally kidnapped and held hostage at this jail since October 24th 2016 on fabricated, false, trumped up charges from New Jersey state prison, where I was brutally attacked by correctional officer's on May 17th 2010, for attacking my original conviction appeal. My first imprisonment appeal...

Decision or Action You Are Challenging

5. What are you challenging in this petition: My custody is illegal / Malicious prosecution, fraud.
 How your sentence is being carried out, calculated, or credited by prison or parole authorities (for example, revocation or calculation of good time credits) My liberty, interest and Constitutional Rights has been intentionally sabotaged by the government and CDCR personnel, Statute obligation agents... species...

Pretrial detention Immigration detention Detainer The validity of your conviction or sentence as imposed (for example, sentence beyond the statutory maximum or improperly calculated under the sentencing guidelines) Disciplinary proceedings Other (explain): *Petitioner is in imminent danger and is being targeted, tormented, harassed by Ku Klux Klan, white supremacists government corrupted officials and their allies... Not guilty.*6. Provide more information about the decision or action you are challenging:
The Bid Bond, Performance Bond and Payment Bond Owing To ME THE PRINCIPAL CREDITOR.(a) Name and location of the agency or court: *1. A SUPERIOR COURT; UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN*
(BA385119-01)(CV13-3428)(CV14-1003)(16 CV18415)(b) Docket number, case number, or opinion number: *(CV-1881)(2:21-cv-00989)*(c) Decision or action you are challenging (for disciplinary proceedings, specify the penalties imposed): *CONVICTION FOR MALICIOUS PROSECUTION, DOUBLE JEOPARDY AND RACKETEER FRAUD (42 USC § 1986) 28 USC § 1338(b); ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT ACT OF 1978 (28 USC § 49, 591-599), 28 USC § 1343(3), SEC. 708(1) OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT; CAL. CRIM. CODE § 6105; CAL. CRIM. CODE § 102(1) (1964). . .*(d) Date of the decision or action: *6-27-2012*

Your Earlier Challenges of the Decision or Action

7. First appeal

Did you appeal the decision, file a grievance, or seek an administrative remedy?

 Yes No

(a) If "Yes," provide:

(1) Name of the authority, agency, or court: *1. A SUPERIOR COURT (U.S. DISTRICT COURT)
(SACRAMENTO SUPERIOR COURT) (U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN)*(2) Date of filing: *2012*(3) Docket number, case number, or opinion number: *(CV13-3428)(CV14-1003)(BA385119-01)*(4) Result: *BRAVILY ATTACKED BY CDEK COP, PROPERTY LOST AND DESTROYED, AND SENT TO UC DAVIS HOSPITAL WITH SERIOUS INJURIES... JULY 17TH 2016*(5) Date of result: *THE COURT IS NOT LISTENING TO MY CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIM AS IF THEY ARE AGAINST THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST ME BY GOVERNMENT GOBLINS...*(6) Issues raised: *MALICIOUS PROSECUTION, DOUBLE JEOPARDY AND RACKETEER FRAUD...**Petitioner was found "NOT GUILTY" AT TRIAL BUT CHARGES WERE FOR COUNTS (1) 245(D)(1) PC COUNT (2) 245(B)(1) PC; COUNT (3) 459 PC; COUNT (4) 245(D)(1) PC; AND COUNT (5) 664-422 PC "NOT GUILTY" BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. . . THIS WAS A VIOLENT SHOOTING CASE WHERE L.A. PSD FIRED THEIR GUN, GLOCK'S AT PETITIONER AND OTHER UNARMED CIVILIANS INSIDE THEIR HOME. . . ON FIRST APPEAL THAT PETITIONER PLANTED A GUN AT THE OFFICER'S COUNTS (1) 245(D)(1) PC AND COUNT (2) 245(D)(1) PC... NOT GUILTY... THE D.A. ANNOUNCED IN THE "RECORDS" THE TRANSCRIPTS THAT IT WAS HIS POSITION TO INFORM THE COURT THAT IT WAS "NOT" TECHNICALLY NO 1(B) INSTRUCTION OF THE EVIDENCE CODE- CRIMINAL NUMBER 2.50 THAT WAS GIVEN TO THE JURY TO FIND PETITIONER GUILTY OF GUILT (6) 12021(C)(1)... THE D.A. FAILED TO PROVE HIS CASE PERIOD. A REASONABLE DOUBT... FORCED PETITIONER TO GO TO PRISON TO BE INTERFIDENTLY TARGETED, TORMENTED & BRAVILY ATTACKED ETC...*

(b) If you answered "No," explain why you did not appeal:

8. Second appeal

After the first appeal, did you file a second appeal to a higher authority, agency, or court?

 Yes No

(a) If "Yes," provide:

(1) Name of the authority, agency, or court:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL
FRAUD JUDGES: DERRYL PREGERSON AND
ALKAI SUGAR'S...(2) Date of filing: I BELIEVE AROUND 2013(3) Docket number, case number, or opinion number: (CV13-3408)(CV14-10403)(4) Result: THE JUDGES AND COURT ESCAPED WITH MY BOND. THEY HAVE
NOT GIVEN ME THE PROCEEDS OF MY BOND, THE FIXTURES, PRODUCTS AND PROCEEDS...(5) Date of result: N/A(6) Issues raised: NY Custody is illegal... THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SUPERIOR COURT'S GOVERNMENT IS IN COMMERCIAL DISHONOR; DEFAULT JUDGMENT...
I ACCEPTED THEIR FABRICATED, FALSE, TRUMPED UP CHARGES FOR VALUE
AND CONSIDERATION, IN RETURN FOR FULL SETTLEMENT AND CLOSURE OF
CASE AND ACCORD... NY SUCP AND AUTOTRIST IS 560592714
I AM INNOCENT OF ALL STATE PENAL STATUTE GOVERNMENT FALSE CHARGES TO
SABOTAGE MY LIBERTY, INTEREST, AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS...

(b) If you answered "No," explain why you did not file a second appeal:

9.

Third appeal

After the second appeal, did you file a third appeal to a higher authority, agency, or court?

 Yes No

(a) If "Yes," provide:

(1) Name of the authority, agency, or court: _____

(2) Date of filing: _____

(3) Docket number, case number, or opinion number: _____

(4) Result: _____

(5) Date of result: _____

(6) Issues raised: _____

(b) If you answered "No," explain why you did not file a third appeal:

(28 USC § 1915(g)) (28 U.S.C. 1338(b))...

10.

Motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255

In this petition, are you challenging the validity of your conviction or sentence as imposed?

 Yes No

If "Yes," answer the following:

(a) Have you already filed a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 that challenged this conviction or sentence?

 Yes No

If "Yes," provide:

- (1) Name of court: _____
- (2) Case number: _____
- (3) Date of filing: _____
- (4) Result: _____
- (5) Date of result: _____
- (6) Issues raised: _____

(b) Have you ever filed a motion in a United States Court of Appeals under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A), seeking permission to file a second or successive Section 2255 motion to challenge this conviction or sentence?

Yes

No *I am not familiar with those numbers & letters*

If "Yes," provide:

- (1) Name of court: _____
- (2) Case number: _____
- (3) Date of filing: _____
- (4) Result: _____
- (5) Date of result: _____
- (6) Issues raised: _____

(c) Explain why the remedy under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 is inadequate or ineffective to challenge your conviction or sentence:

THE EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE IS VIOLATED IF A CRIMINAL PROSECUTION IS DELIBERATELY BASED UPON AN UNJUSTIFIABLE STANDARDS SUCH AS RACE, RELIGION, OR OTHER ARBITRARY CLASSIFICATION. THE EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSES OF THE FEDERAL AND STATE CONSTITUTIONS GUARANTEE INDIVIDUALS FROM "INTENTIONAL AND PURPOSEFUL" INVIOLATIONS DISCRIMINATION IN THE ENFORCEMENT OF ALL LAWS, INCLUDING PENAL STATUTE, ETC... A STATE ACTS BY ITS LEGISLATIVE, ITS EXECUTIVE, OR ITS JUDICIAL AUTHORITIES. IT CAN ACT IN NO OTHER WAY... THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION OF U.S. CONST. AMEND. XIV. THEREFORE, IT MUST MEAN THAT AN AGENT OF THE STATE, OR OF THE OFFICERS OR AGENTS OF THE STATE, WHEN IT'S POWERS ARE EXERTED, SHALL DENY TO ANY PERSON WITHIN IT'S JURISDICTION THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW.

11. Appeals of immigration proceedings

Does this case concern immigration proceedings?

Yes

No

If "Yes," provide:

- (a) Date you were taken into immigration custody: _____
- (b) Date of the removal or reinstatement order: _____
- (c) Did you file an appeal with the Board of Immigration Appeals?

Yes

No

If "Yes," provide:

- (1) Date of filing: _____
(2) Case number: _____
(3) Result: _____
(4) Date of result: _____
(5) Issues raised: _____

(d) Did you appeal the decision to the United States Court of Appeals?

Yes No

If "Yes," provide:

- (1) Name of court: _____
(2) Date of filing: _____
(3) Case number: _____
(4) Result: _____
(5) Date of result: _____
(6) Issues raised: _____

12. Other appeals

Other than the appeals you listed above, have you filed any other petition, application, or motion about the issues raised in this petition?

Yes No

If "Yes," provide:

- (a) Kind of petition, motion, or application: _____
(b) Name of the authority, agency, or court: _____

(c) Date of filing: _____
(d) Docket number, case number, or opinion number: _____
(e) Result: _____
(f) Date of result: _____
(g) Issues raised: _____

Grounds for Your Challenge in This Petition

13. State every ground (reason) that supports your claim that you are being held in violation of the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. Attach additional pages if you have more than four grounds. State the facts supporting each ground. Any legal arguments must be submitted in a separate memorandum.

GROUND ONE: *Petitioner custody is illegal... Malicious prosecution; double Jeopardy and Racketeer Fraud. STATE GOVERNMENT COVERED UP OF L.A.P.D. DELIBERATELY FORCE ACTION ON JUNE 1, 2011, CASE # LA-85119-01 LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT... THE LOS ANGELES DISTRICT ATTORNEY RUINED TO DRIVE HIS CASE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT... THE JURY DELIBERATION VERDICT WAS NOT GUILTY" OF CHARGES. JUROR COURT 3 (1) 245(D)(1) PC, COURT (2) 245(D)(1), COURT (3) 459, COURT (4) 245(A)(2), AND COURT (5) 064-422 "NOT Guilty"*

- (a) Supporting facts (Be brief. Do not cite cases or law.):

THE JURY DELIBERATION'S VERDICT WAS "NOT Guilty" OF COURTS (1) AND (2) 245(D)(1) TO SHOW SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE OF PREVARICATION - UNLAWFUL SHOOTING OF A VALID CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIM TO APPEAL COURT (6) AND OVERTURN AND RETURN BACK TO THE DISTRICT COURT FOR FURTHER DIMINISH RECONSTRUCTION OF A ILLEGAL 6 YEAR SENTENCE OF MALICIOUS PROSECUTION DOUBLE JEOPARDY AND RACKETEER FRAUD... IN THE TRANSCRIPT IT REVEALS THE D.A. MADE AN ANNOUNCEMENT, AN EXAMPLE, AN ANALOGY... THAT IT WAS HIS POSITION TO INFORM THE COURT THAT IT WAS "NOT" TECHNICALLY (NOT) INSTRUCTION OF THE EVIDENCE CODE - CALIFORNIA NUMBER 2.50 THAT WAS GIVEN TO THE JURY TO FIND PETITIONER GUILTY OF COURT (6) 100% (ASCT)...

- (b) Did you present Ground One in all appeals that were available to you?

Yes No

GROUND TWO: *WHAT GOES ON IN THE COURT ROOMS GO BACK TO EDWARD THE FIRST - IT'S CALLED "STATUTE MERCHANT" AND WHAT IT IS, IS A Bond of MERCHANT OR Bond of RECORDS. THE "STATUTES THEMSELVES" ARE THE Bond AND WHAT THEY DO IS DUPLICATE TO "STATUTES" THAT THEY CHARGE YOU UNDER WITH WHAT THEY CALL A "RECOGNIZANCE Bond" AND PEOPLE SIGN THE "RECOGNIZANCE Bond" WITHOUT READING WHAT THE Bond SAYS... AND WHAT IT SAYS IS, IS THAT YOU AGREE TO PAY BACK THE DEBT. THIS IS CIVIL NOT CRIMINAL...*

- (a) Supporting facts (Be brief. Do not cite cases or law.): *THERE'S A BOOK OUT CALLED: JURISDICTION AND PRACTICE OF THE LAW OF ADMIRALTY, BY JOHN E. HALL... WHAT THEIR DOING IS ALL ABOUT Bond's. WHEN YOU GO INTO THE COURTROOM AFTER YOU'RE ARRESTED THEY USE TWO DIFFERENT SETS OF Bond's. WHAT THEY DO WHEN YOU'RE ARRESTED THEY FILL OUT A "BID Bond" - STANDARD FORM 24, AND YOU GET THE PERFORMANCE Bond S.F. 25 AND THE PAYMENT Bond S.F. 25A... THE DISTRICT COURT USES STANDARD FORMS 273, 274 & 275, AND THEY ARE ALL FILLED OUT BY GSA = GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION. THE GSA IS UNDER THE "COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY" WHICH IS UNDER THE GAO = GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE... IN THE PRINCIPAL AND THE REQUIREMENT ON THE SURETY... IN ALSO THE UNDERWRITER ON THE PAYMENT Bond THAT GUARANTEES THE PERFORMANCE Bond THAT GUARANTEES THE BID Bond... THEIR STEALING AT IDENTITY... 28 U.S.C. § 1338(b)*

- (b) Did you present Ground Two in all appeals that were available to you?

Yes No

"NOT ALL"

GROUND THREE: *WHAT'S GOING ON IN THE COURTROOM IS THAT THEY ARE Suing YOU FOR A DEBT COLLECTION... WHAT IT IS, IS AN ACTION OF "ASSUMPTION" THE WORD "PRESUME" COMES FROM THE WORD "ASSUMPTION" WHICH MEANS "I AGREE OR I PRESUME TO DO..." AN ACT OF ASSUMPTION WHICH MEANS "I AGREE TO A COLLECTION OF A DEBT". IF YOU LOOK AT THESE Bond's, Bid Bond, Performance Bond & PAYMENT Bond ALL HAVE A "PERPETUAL SUM" ATTACHED TO IT... THE REASON FOR THE "PERPETUAL SUM" IS IF YOU DON'T PAY THE DEBT, YOU GO INTO DEFECT JUDGEMENT... THAT IS WHAT IS GOING ON IN THE COURT ROOM...*

- (a) Supporting facts (Be brief. Do not cite cases or law.):

THIS IS WHAT THEY USED TO DO BACK IN EDWARD THE 1ST DAY: IF YOU OWNED A DEBT THEY WOULD SEND A SHERIFF OUT WITH A WARRANT TO ARREST YOU... THIS IS ALL CIVIL, THIS IS NOT CRIMINAL... JUST A SMOKE SCREEN TO COVER UP WHAT THEY ARE DOING WITH MERCHANTILE CIVIL LAW AND WHAT THEY USED TO DO WHEN THEY ARREST PEOPLE WITH A WARRANT AND BROUGHT THE PERSON INTO COURT AND MADE THEM SIGN A Bond TO RELEASE UNTIL THE CIVIL SUIT CONTINUED... IT ACTUALLY SAYS "CIVIL SUIT" IN CLERK'S PRAXIS...

- (b) Did you present Ground Three in all appeals that were available to you?

Yes No

"NOT ALL"

GROUND FOUR:

Here's what goes on: A CONTRACTOR come in OR ANY CORPORATION, could come in and what they do in TENDER A BID BOND TO THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT AND THEY BUY UP THESE STATE COURT JUDGMENTS AND ANY TIME YOU ISSUE A BID BOND THESE HAS TO BE A REINSURER. THEY EVEN HAVE A REINSURANCE TREATY... INTERNATIONAL TREATIES... IF YOU READ THE CONSTITUTION, TREATIES ARE THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND...

(a) Supporting facts (Be brief. Do not cite cases or law.):

So THEY GET A "REINSURANCE COMPANY" TO COME IN AND ACT AS "SURETY FOR THE BID BOND" THEY BRING IN A PERFORMANCE BOND... ALL OF THESE BONDS PAYMENT & PERFORMANCE TAKE "SURETY BOND'S" AND ANY TIME YOU ISSUE A BID BOND IT HAS TO HAVE A SURETY: WHERE IS THE SURETY going? IT GUARANTEEING OR REINSURING THE BID BOND BY ISSUING A PERFORMANCE BOND. THAT'S WHAT THESE PERFORMANCE BOND ARE. THEN THEY GET AN UNDERWRITER AND THAT COULD BE EITHER AN INVESTMENT BROKER OR AN INVESTMENT BANKER. THEY COME IN AND UNDERWRITE THE PERFORMANCE BOND WHICH IS REINSURING THE BID BOND. WHAT DOES THE UNDERWRITER DO WITH THE PAYMENT BOND. THE UNDERWRITER TAKE THE 3 BOND AND POOL THEM AND KNOWN AS "MORTGAGED BACK SECURITIES" AND WHEN YOU POOL THESE MBS THEIR CALLED "BONDS" AND THEIR SOLD TO A COMPANY CALLED TBA WHICH IS THE "BOND MARKET ASSOCIATION." THIS IS AN ACTUAL CORPORATION

(b) Did you present Ground Four in all appeals that were available to you?

Yes No

"NOT ALL"

14. If there are any grounds that you did not present in all appeals that were available to you, explain why you did not: *PETITIONER WAS INTENTIONALLY TARGETED, TORMENTED, BRUTALLY ATTACKED,*

AND FALSELY CHARGED AGAIN, AND KIDNAPPED AND HELD HOSTAGE IN THIS SHERIFF JAIL SINCE OCTOBER 24TH 2016. AND THE CORRECTIONAL COPS THAT GOT ME SITTING IN THIS JAIL HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM NEW FOLSOM STATE PRISON TO THE INVESTIGATION OF CORRUPTION ETC... OFFICER DANIEL GATLAND" SEE SACRAMENTO BEE NEWS PAPER'S DATED (4-18-2021) (4-26-2021) (4-30-2021) (5-1-2021). NEW FOLSOM STATE PRISON CORRECTIONAL COPS CORRUPTION... INVESTIGATION...

Request for Relief15. State exactly what you want the court to do: *GET ME IMMEDIATELY RELEASED FROM CUSTODY;*
THEY HAVE NOT CLOSED MY ACCOUNT. THEY HAVE NOT GIVEN ME THE PROCEEDS OF MY BOND, THE FIXTURES, PRODUCTS & PROCEEDS... PURSUANT TO THE AGREEMENT IN ADVISORY UNDER RULE 918. I WANT THE BOND BACK AND TO BE RELEASED FROM CUSTODY... I WANT FULL SETTLEMENT AND CLOSURE AND RELEASE THE BOND...
MY LAST 4 CUSIP AND AUTOTRIS NUMBERS ARE (3714)

CUSIP MEANS:

"COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM SECURITIES IDENTIFICATION PROCESSES"...

AUTOTRIS MEANS:

"AUTOMATED TRACKING IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM"...

THIS NUMBER; THEY PUT IT IN A NUMBER... ITS IN A MODULE AND EVERY FEDERAL AGENCY AND EVERY STATE AGENCY HAS MY TRACKING NUMBER... THEY HAVE IT IN THE CRIMINAL TASK FORCE THAT USES IT AND SO DO ALL OF THE COURTS AND ALL OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENTS THE CITY, COUNTY SHERIFF, FEMA, HOMELAND SECURITY... ETC...

Declaration Under Penalty Of Perjury

If you are incarcerated, on what date did you place this petition in the prison mail system:

6-20-2021

I declare under penalty of perjury that I am the petitioner, I have read this petition or had it read to me, and the information in this petition is true and correct. I understand that a false statement of a material fact may serve as the basis for prosecution for perjury. *ALSO SEE: "ERIE V. TOMPKINS" 82 LEd 1188, 309 US 64 (4-25-1938)*

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE V. REPORTERS' COMMITTEE FOR FREEDOM OF THE PRESS, 103 LEd 2d 114, 489 US 749 (3-22-1989)
TRUSTEE IN BANKRUPTCY V. ANGLO SCANDINAVIAN CORPORATION, 298 F. SUPP. 310, 19609 US DIST. LEXIS 9509; 6 U.C.C. REP. SERV. 3-12-1969... CIV. NO. S-781...

Date: 6-20-2021

M. M. ; M., The Poet

Signature of Petitioner

Signature of Attorney or other authorized person, if any

Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C.A. 1338(b)

Also see:

*NICHOLAS NIKONASTRA V. KONICA BUSINESS MACHINES U.S.A. INC.
et al., 43 CAL. APP. 4TH 1628, 51 CAL. Rptr. 2d 528 (3-28-1996)
DAILY JOURNAL DAR 3612, 29 U.C.C. REP. SERV. 2d
NO. B684674*

*In Re Winship, 90 Sct 1068, 25 LEd 2d 368, 397 US 358
(3-31-1970)...*

MISSOURI V. THE MUNICIPAL COURT, 15 CAL. 3d 286, 540 P. 2d 44, 124 CAL. Rptr. 204 (9-24-1975).

Cole v. ARKANSAS, 92 LEd 644, 333 US 196 (2-5-1948).

"Cong Globe, 42d Cong. 1st sess., 789 (1871)"

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

DATE : APRIL 13, 2021
JUDGE : SHELLEYANNE W.L. CHANG
REPORTER : NONE

DEPT. NO : 21
CLERK : E. HIGGINBOTHAM
BAILIFF : NONE

In re the Matter of

Case No. 21HC00115

MAURICE MILES, SR. An unresolvable application of the facts in light of
THE EVIDENCE... Petitioner pleaded "Not Guilty".
Petitioner was found "NOT GUILTY" AT TRIAL FOR CHARGE AND FOR
COURT(S) (1), (2), (3), (4) AND (5)... THE DELIBERATION VERDICT BY THE JURY...
SEE: COLE V. ARKANSAS, 92 LED 644, 333 VS 196 (3-8-1948).

Nature of Proceedings:

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS - ORDER

The Court has received and considered the above-entitled petition for writ of habeas corpus. The petition is DENIED. Petitioner pleaded "Not Guilty"... DELIBERATION VERDICT BY THE JURY WAS NOT GUILTY OF COURT(S) (1) 245(D)(1) PC, COURT (2) 245(D)(1) PC, COURT (3) 245(D)(1) PC, COURT (4) 245(D)(1) PC; AND COURT (5) 604-422 PC... "NOT GUILTY" OF THESE CHARGES... THE L.A.P.D. FIRED THEIR 9MM GLOCK'S AT PETITIONER BASED ON COURT(S) (3) 245(D)(1) PC AND (2) 245(D)(1) PC... THE JURY DID NOT JUSTIFY THE OFFICER UNFAIRLY HOLDING UP: LIES; STATE GOVERNMENT COVER UP;

a. Challenge to 2011 Conviction 245(D)(1) PC... A petition for writ of habeas corpus cannot serve as a second appeal or substitute appeal. (*In re Harris* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 813, 829.) Claims that could have been raised on appeal are not cognizable on habeas corpus unless the petitioner can show that (1) clear and fundamental constitutional error strikes at the heart of the trial process; (2) the court lacked fundamental jurisdiction; (3) the court acted in excess of jurisdiction not requiring a redetermination of facts; or (4) a change in law after the appeal affected the petitioner. (*In re Dixon* (1953) 41 Cal.2d 756, 759; *In re Harris*, *supra*, at p. 828.)

Here, Petitioner challenges the legality of his 2011 conviction from Los Angeles County case BA385119. Specifically, he claims his conviction was the result of prosecutorial misconduct and the use of false evidence, the trial court erred in imposing enhancements, and the trial constituted double jeopardy. These claims are all based on matters in the record and could have been brought on appeal. Petitioner has not shown that his claims fall into any of the above-stated exceptions. Furthermore, the claim is untimely. A habeas petitioner must "explain and justify any significant delay in seeking relief." (*In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 765, fn. 5.) The length of delay is measured from the time that a petition becomes or should reasonably have become aware of the grounds for relief. (*Ibid.*) Petitioner does not explain the decade long delay in raising this claim. Accordingly, this claim is denied.

Petitioner APPEALED SEE CASE # (CV13-2428)
(CV14-1063)
(DDH/AS)

BOOK :
PAGE :
DATE : APRIL 13, 2021
CASE NO. : 21HC00115
CASE TITLE : IN RE MAURICE MILES, SR.,

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento

BY: E. HIGGINBOTHAM
Deputy Clerk

CASE NUMBER: 21HC00115

DEPARTMENT : 21

CASE TITLE : IN RE MAURICE MILES, *SR.*

PROCEEDINGS: PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS - ORDER

b. Return of "Bid Bond"

To state a prima facie case, a habeas petition must state, with particularity, the facts upon which the petitioner is relying to justify relief, and be supported by reasonably available documentary evidence; vague conclusory allegations are insufficient to warrant issuance of a writ. (*In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 303-304; *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 474; *In re Harris* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 813, 827 fn.5.) In addition, the petitioner bears the burden of stating a prima facie case that if true, would entitle him to relief. (*In re Bower* (1985) 38 Cal.3d 865, 872).

Petitioner is currently at the Sacramento County Main Jail awaiting adjudication of criminal charges filed in case 16FE018715. Bail is set in the amount of \$2 million. He requests the return of his "bid bond" standard Form 24. First, the standard Form 24 bid bond referred to in the petition is intended for use by government contractors to ensure financial security in Federal Government contracts. It is not the same as the bail bond ordered in a criminal case. Additionally, while Petitioner provides a lengthy history of the use of bonds and about federal jurisdiction, he provides no legal authority and supporting facts justifying return of any bond nor has he shown that he is paid any bond. Petitioner has failed to state a prima facie case for relief.

*I HAVE ALREADY ACCEPTED THE CHARGES FOR "VALUE AND CONSIDERATION" IN RETURN FOR FULL SETTLEMENT AND DISCHARGE OF THE ACCOUNT...
USE MY EXEMPTION AS PRINCIPAL... and Return*

DATED: 4.13.2021 *W/ my Bond...*

SHELLEYANNE W.L. CHANG

SHELLEYANNE W.L. CHANG

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

MY LAST 4 CUSIP AND AUTOTRIS NUMBERS ARE (3714)

CUSIP MEANS:

Committee on Uniform Securities "Identification" Processes

AUTOTRIS MEANS:

Automated Tracking "Identification" System

Pursuant to Rule 8 FRCP

"I ACCEPT FOR VALUE".

BOOK :

PAGE :

DATE :

CASE NO. :

CASE TITLE : IN RE MAURICE MILES, *SR.*

Superior Court of California, County of
Sacramento

BY: E HIGGINBOTHAM
Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

SEE: *Robinson v. NHRuffi*, 895 F.2d 649 (CA11, 1990)
STRENGTH V. HUBERT, 854 F.2d 420 AND *v. 51* (CA11, 1988)
Coogan v. Wixen, 826 F.2d 170, 175 (CA10, 1987)
Elliott v. Carrington, 19 HCA ST TR 1029 (1765)

DATE : JUNE 16, 2021 DEPT. NO : 21
JUDGE : SHELLEYANNE CHANG CLERK : E. HIGGINBOTHAM
REPORTER : NONE BAILIFF : NONE

*ALSO SEE: OLIVER Wendell Holmes' famous ESSAY:
In re "PRIVILEGE, NOVICE AND INVENT" 8 HARV. L. REV. 1...*

MAURICE MILES, SR.

Case No. 21HC00115

On Habeas Corpus. *AMERICAN GUILD OF MUSICAL ARTISTS V. PETRILLO*, 286 N.Y. 220, 231, 36 N.E. 2d 123.
OPERA ON TOUR INC. V. WEBER 285 N.Y. 348, 34 N.E.
GREEN V. DAVIES, 182 N.Y. 499, 75 N.E. 536

Nature of Proceedings: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION - ORDER

An unreasonable application of the facts in light of the evidence

Petitioner's objection to the Court's order issued April 13, 2021 in the above-referenced case has been received, filed and considered. The Court will construe the objection as a motion for reconsideration. It is HEREBY ORDERED that the motion is DENIED.

This application is fraudulent, deft's connivance...
Petitioner is incarcerated at the Sacramento County Main Jail awaiting trial in Sacramento County case number 16FE018715. On March 1, 2021, he filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus under the above-referenced case number challenging his 2011 conviction from Los Angeles County and the bail order set in his current Sacramento County proceedings. This Court denied the petition for writ of habeas corpus. Petitioner has now submitted this request to reconsider the denial of his habeas petition.

PETITIONER WAS found "NOT GUILTY" AT TRIAL FOR CHARGES: (1)(2)(3)(4) AND (5)...
No appeal lies from an order denying a petition for writ of habeas corpus. [Citations.]" (*Jackson v. Superior Court* (2010) 189 Cal.App.4th 1051, 1064.) "An order denying a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the superior court is final immediately upon its filing, and review of the order can only be had by the filing of a new petition in the Court of Appeal." (*Id.* at 1064, fn. 5, quoting *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767, fn. 7.) Thus, there is no express provision for a motion to reconsider.

PETITIONER pleaded "NOT GUILTY" ... THIS WAS A "OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTING" CASE...
Nevertheless, Petitioner states no meritorious grounds or bases that persuade the Court that its prior order under the petition was incorrect, improper, or otherwise erroneous. (*Jackson, supra*, 189 Cal.App.4th 1051.) Nor does Petitioner present any new facts or claims that would warrant reconsideration. Instead, the motion merely reargues the same facts and arguments raised in the initial petition. *"I'M INNOCENT!"*

DATED: 6-16-2021

SHELLEYANNE W.L. CHANG
*false signature**SIRIANA SIGNATURE... (U.C.C 3-419)...*

*PETITIONER HAS STATED "MERITORIOUS"
GROUNDS AND BASES... Petitioner
factual is illegal ... Petitioner is
innocent... 442 U.S.C.S/1986
(78 U.S.C. 1338(b))
(CONG. GLOBE, 42d CONGRT SESS, 189(1871)*

HONORABLE SHELLEYANNE CHANG,
JUDGE OF THE SACRAMENTO SUPERIOR COURT
Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (28 USC § 591-599)...

BOOK : 21 Superior Court of California, County of
PAGE : 21HC00115 Sacramento
DATE : JUNE 9, 2021
CASE NO. : 21HC00115
CASE TITLE : IN RE: MAURICE MILES, SR.

BY: E. HIGGINBOTHAM
Deputy Clerk

CASE NUMBER: 21HC00115

DEPARTMENT : 21

CASE TITLE : IN RE: MAURICE MILES, SR.

PROCEEDINGS: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAILING
(C.C.P. Sec. 1013a(4))

I, the Clerk of the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento, certify that I am not a party to this cause, and on the date shown below I served the foregoing **ORDER** by depositing true copies thereof, enclosed in separate, sealed envelopes with the postage fully prepaid, in the United States Mail at Sacramento, California, each of which envelopes was addressed respectively to the persons and addresses shown below:

MAURICE MILES, SR.,
 651 I STREET
 SACRAMENTO, CA 94814

DISTRICT ATTORNEY
 ATTN: JTI UNIT
 SENT VIA INTEROFFICE MAIL

ROB BONTA
 OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
 P.O. BOX 944255
 SACRAMENTO, CA 94244

An unreasonable application of the facts in light of the "evidence".
 28 USC § 2254 BAKER v. CITY OF PLAINE (MAY CIR. 2000) 245 F.3d 1138
 MOORE V. CALDERON (MAY CIR. 1997) 108 F.3d 261.
 Petitioners' "not guilty"; counts (1), (2), (3)(4) and (5) THE TRIAL DELIBERATION VERDICTS; - "THE JURY"

I, the undersigned deputy clerk, declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: June 16, 2021

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento
 STRAW MAN SIGNATUREBy: E. HIGGINBOTHAME. HIGGINBOTHAM, Deputy Clerk

"WHENEVER, THEN, THERE IS A DENIAL OF EQUAL PROTECTION BY THE STATE, THE COURTS OF JUSTICE OF THE NATION STAND WITH OPEN DOORS, READY TO RECEIVE AND HEAR WITH IMPARTIAL ATTENTION THE COMPLAINTS OF THOSE WHO ARE DENIED REDREES ELSEWHERE... HERE MAY COME THE WEAK AND WICKED AND UNTRUSTED, WITH ASSURANCE THAT THEY SHALL BE HEARD... HERE MAY COME THE MAN SMITTEN WITH MANY STRIPES AND ASK FOR REDRESS... HERE MAY COME THE NATION IN HER MAJESTY, AND DEMAND THE TRIAL AND PUNISHMENT OF OFFENDER; WHEN ALL, ALL OTHER TRIBUNALS ARE CLOSED..."

"CAN THESE MEANS BE MADE EFFECTUAL? CAN WE THUS SUPPRESS THESE WRONGS? I WILL SAY WE CAN BUT TRY... THE UNITED STATES INDEPENDENCE, CANNOT BE PUT UNDER TERROR" AS "LOCAL JUDGES CAN"; THEIR STAMPATRIES ARE NOT NEARLY IDENTIFIED WITH THOSE OF THE VICINAGE. THE JURORS ARE TAKEN FROM THE STATE, AND NOT THE NEIGHBORHOOD; THEY WILL BE THROWN THE SHERIFF CAN MAKE ARRESTS WITH CERTAINTY, AND, WITH THE AID OF THE MARSHAL WITH MORE POWER OF FEDERAL'S IN SPITE OF HIS BOUNDING AND COMBINED RESISTANCE, SUCH AS MAY BE EXPECTED... THIS, AT LEAST; ACTING UNDER ALL ITS SYLLESTIN OBLIGATION'S OF DUTY TO COUNTY AND GOD... CAN WE TRUST IT, OR ARE WE AFRAID OF OUR OWN INSTITUTIONS? DOES THE GRIM SHADOW OF THE STATE STEP WITH THE DISTRITAL COURT, LIKE A "GOBLIN" THAT "WEEKS" AT JUSTICE THE STATE THAT "LICENSES" "WILFUL" THE STATE THAT "GIVES DUE" WHEN THE WE CAN TRUST OUR UNITED STATES COURTS; AND WE PROPOSE TO DO SO. I." MONROE V. PARK 365 U.S. AT 753.

BOOK : 21
 PAGE : 21HC00115
 DATE : JUNE 16, 2021
 CASE NO. : 21HC00115
 CASE TITLE : IN RE: MAURICE MILES, SR.

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento

BY: E. HIGGINBOTHAM
Deputy Clerk

cc: Case 2:21-cv-01143-TLN-DB Document 1 Filed 06/28/21 Page 13 of 13
KBRACKETT V. GRISHMAN, 12 NY 934, 406, 26 NE 376... SUPREME COURT
BOB V. HECKSHER 235 APP. DIV. 82, 83, 256, NY 126
KEEBLE V. HICKERINGILL, 11 EAST 574 u... FILED

JUN 9 2021

Jorge Navarrete Clerk

S267689

Deputy

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

En Banc

In re MAURICE MILES, SR., on Habeas Corpus.

The Petition

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Robbins* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 770, 780 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are untimely].)

XXX

XXX

Afford a federal right is abundantly clear that one reason the legislation was passed was to afford a federal right in federal courts because, by reason of prejudice, passion, neglect, intolerance or otherwise, "state laws" might not be enforced and the claims of citizens to the enjoyment of rights, privileges, and immunities guaranteed by the "Fourteenth Amendment might be denied by the "state agencies" 362 U.S. at 180 S.Ct. 492, 81 S.Ct. 473, id., 193. S.L.E.D. 2d 492, 81 / S.Ct. 473 (HAKLAVI, J., concurring). . . Also see

Williamson v. PAKER (2000) 529 U.S. 302 (120 S.Ct. 1495, 146 L.Ed. 2d 389)
28 U.S.C. § 1254; PAKER v. CITY OF READING 9th CIR. 2000) 205 F.3d 1138; MOORE v. CALDERON (9th CIR. 1997)

ReleasE THE Bond...

Chief Justice Cantil-Sakauye

CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice